



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/817,599	04/02/2004	Michael Joseph Toutonghi	13768.990	3131
47973 7590 06/05/2008 WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT 1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111				
EXAMINER				
WILLIAMS, CLAYTON R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2157				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/05/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/817,599

Applicant(s)

TOUTONGHI, MICHAEL JOSEPH

Examiner

Clayton R. Williams

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2004.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CD-100)
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3, 9, 14-16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yukie et al., US 6,956,833 (hereinafter Yukie).

For claims 1, 14 and 18, Yukie discloses a data acquisition device (col. 6, lines 55-63, disclosure of digital camera with network interface for transferring images to a remote storage device; inherent in disclosure of this apparatus and method is presence of processor and memory for carrying out these methods) to transfer a new data object to a user storage device, the method comprising:

detecting a new data object (col. 6, lines 55-63);

determining an availability of one or more user storage devices to store the new data object in response to the detecting (col. 6, lines 55-63);

establishing a communications session with at least one available user storage device (col. 6, lines 55-63, disclosure that camera establishes contact with remote storage); and

sending the new data object to the at least one available user storage device for storage therein (col. 6, lines 55-63).

For claims 2, 15 and 19, Yukie discloses further comprising first determining if a type of the new data object is configured for automatic transfer to an available user storage device (col. 6, lines 55-63, disclosure that upon user snapping a photograph, the camera initiates processes of sending captured data to remote storage); and

determining the availability of the one or more user storage devices only if the type of the new data object is configured for automatic transfer (col. 6, lines 55-63).

For claims 3, 16 and 20, Yukie discloses wherein the new data object comprises a media file selected from the group consisting of a sound file, a voice file, an image file, and a video file (col. 6, lines 55-63, digital camera produces image files).

Art Unit: 2157

For claim 9, Yukie discloses the method of claim 4, wherein communicating with the online connection service comprises sending authentication information to authenticate the data acquisition device to the online connection service (col. 4, lines 1-8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4, 10, 11, 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yukie, in view of Bucher, US 6,956,833 (hereinafter Bucher).

For claims 4 and 17, Yukie fails to explicitly disclose wherein determining the availability of the one or more devices comprises communicating with an online connection service to obtain a list of available user storage devices associated with the data acquisition device.

However, Bucher discloses a remote data storage system that presents a user with a list of remote storage devices to which data may be sent (Bucher, col.

Art Unit: 2157

7, lines 1-10). Yukie and Bucher are analogous art because both are from the field of the transfer of data from a client to a remote server.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Yukie with those of Bucher, because this modification extends the remote storage system as taught by Yukie to allow for a plurality of possible storage options that are presented to a user in a tabular format.

For claim 10, the combination of Yukie and Bucher discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising requesting permission to store the new data object at the at least one available user storage device before sending the object to the at least one available user storage device (Bucher, col. 4, lines 23-29, disclosure that remote storage device must first approve data transfer before receipt of data).

For claim 11, the combination of Yukie and Bucher discloses the method of claim 10, wherein the requesting permission is performed implicitly by sending authentication information to the at least one available user storage device and receiving an authentication success message from the at least one available user storage device (Bucher, col. 4, lines 23-29, disclosure that remote storage device must first approve data transfer before receipt of data).

For claim 13, the combination of Yukie and Bucher discloses the method of claim 1, wherein establishing the communication session with the at least one available

Art Unit: 2157

user storage device comprises establishing a link with the at least one available user storage device through an intermediate proxy server (Bucher, col. 4, lines 43-48).

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yukie, in view of Bucher, and further in view of Snyder et al., US 5,564,109 (hereinafter Snyder).

For claim 5, the combination of Yukie and Bucher fails to explicitly disclose further comprising receiving a prioritized list of available user storage devices associated with the data acquisition device from the online connection service.

However, Snyder discloses a system which provides a user with a ranked list of peripherals which can perform a designated task. (Synder, col. 4, lines 5-10). The combination of Yukie and Bucher and Synder are analogous art because both solve the problem of matching a user device with an appropriate remote device by way of providing a list of suitable devices to a requesting user device.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of the combination of Yukie and Bucher with those of Synder, because this modification extends the remote storage system as taught by the combination of Yukie and Bucher to include providing a

requesting user device with a ranked list of available entities on which to store data.

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yukie, in view of Bucher, and further in view of Harrow et al., US 20030009586 (hereinafter Harrow).

For claim 12, the combination of Yukie and Bucher fails to explicitly disclose wherein establishing the communication session with the at least one available user storage device comprises establishing a peer- to-peer link with the at least one available user storage device.

However, Harrow discloses a system which directs a client to establish a peer-to-peer connection to another peer for the purpose of carrying out a desired function (Harrow, [0027]). The combination of Yukie and Bucher and Harrow are analogous art because both are from the field of matching a user device with an appropriate remote device to carry out a desired function.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of the combination of Yukie and Bucher with those of Harrow, because this modification extends the remote storage system as taught by the combination of Yukie and Bucher.

8. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yukie, in view of Bucher, in view of Snyder, and further in view of Domenikos et al., US 5838916 (hereinafter Domenikos).

For claim 6, the combination of Yukie, Bucher and Snyder fails to explicitly disclose further comprising receiving information on the communications protocols supported by each available user storage device on the prioritized list.

However, Domenikos discloses a system which provides a client system with a list of servers, including communication protocol information, that provide a desired service (Domenikos, col. 19, lines 18-35). The combination of Yukie, Bucher and Snyder and Domenikos are analogous art because both solve the problem of providing a user device with an appropriate remote device by way of providing a list of suitable devices to a requesting user device.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of the combination of Yukie, Bucher and Snyder with those of Domenikos, because this modification extends the the combination to include providing a requesting user device with a ranked list, which includes protocol information, of available entities on which to store data.

For claim 7, the combination of Yukie, Bucher, Snyder and Domenikos discloses the method of claim 6, wherein the sending of the new data object is in accordance with the communications protocol supported by the at least one

Art Unit: 2157

available user storage device (Domenikos, col. 19, lines 18-35, it is inherent that user device will make use of information collected regarding methods for interfacing with remote devices with regard to establishing connection).

For claim 8, the combination of Yukie, Bucher, Snyder and Domenikos discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising receiving a network address for each available user storage device on the prioritized list (Domenikos, col. 19, lines 18-35, disclosure that list contains server names).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clayton R. Williams whose telephone number is 571-270-3801. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8 a.m. - 5 p.m.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CRW

/Ario Etienne/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157